

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

LUFKIN DIVISION

NIGEL PAUL GARDNER	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:15-CV-128
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID	§	

MEMORANDUM ORDER OVERRULING PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS AND ADOPTING
THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Petitioner Nigel Paul Gardner, a prisoner confined in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division, brought this petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

The court ordered that this matter be referred to the Honorable Keith F. Giblin, United States Magistrate Judge, for consideration pursuant to applicable laws and orders of this court. The magistrate judge recommends dismissing the petition as barred by the statute of limitations.

The court has received and considered the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge, along with the record and the pleadings. Petitioner filed objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation.

The court has conducted a *de novo* review of the objections in relation to the pleadings and the applicable law. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). After careful consideration of all the pleadings and the relevant case law, the court concludes that petitioner's objections lack merit. Petitioner contends that he is entitled to equitable tolling because his attorney did not provide petitioner with a copy of his case file and the prison law library had inadequate staff and missing legal materials. These are not the sort of "extraordinary circumstances" that would warrant equitable tolling. *Holland v.*

Florida, 560 U.S. 631, 130 S. Ct. 2549, 2562 (2010); *Sutton v. Cain*, 722 F.3d 312, 316 (5th Cir. 2013). Further, petitioner is not entitled to equitable tolling because he did not diligently pursue his rights. In fact, petitioner offers no explanation for his nine-month delay in filing his federal habeas application after the denial of relief in state court.

In this case, the petitioner is not entitled to the issuance of a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a judgment denying federal habeas corpus relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253; FED. R. APP. P. 22(b). The standard for granting a certificate of appealability, like that for granting a certificate of probable cause to appeal under prior law, requires the petitioner to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000); *Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5th Cir. 2004); *see also Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1982). In making that substantial showing, the petitioner need not establish that he should prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84; *Avila v. Quarterman*, 560 F.3d 299, 304 (5th Cir. 2009). If the petition was denied on procedural grounds, the petitioner must show that jurists of reason would find it debatable: (1) whether the petition raises a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right, and (2) whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling. *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484; *Elizalde*, 362 F.3d at 328. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability is resolved in favor of the petitioner, and the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir. 2000).

Here, the petitioner has not shown that any of the issues raised by his claims are subject to debate among jurists of reason, or that a procedural ruling was incorrect. In addition, the questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. Therefore, the petitioner has failed to make a sufficient showing to merit the issuance of a certificate of appealability.

Accordingly, petitioner's objections are **OVERRULED**. The findings of fact and the conclusions of law of the magistrate judge are correct, and the report and recommendation of the magistrate judge is **ADOPTED**. A final judgment will be entered in this case in accordance with the magistrate judge's recommendation. A certificate of appealability will not be issued.

SIGNED this 9th day of October, 2015.


MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE